

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**JOHN SHERMAN BENGE,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**MARK NOOTH,**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-751-SB

**ORDER**

**Michael H. Simon, District Judge.**

United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on April 20, 2017. ECF 28. Judge Beckerman recommended that Petitioner's Second Amended Habeas Corpus Petition (ECF 13) be denied and that a Certificate of Appealability be denied on the basis that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

Petitioner timely filed an objection. ECF 33. Petitioner argues that Judge Beckerman erred in finding that: (1) Petitioner failed to demonstrate that his claims had some merit under *Martinez v. Ryan*, 566 U.S. 1 (2012); (2) counsel's objections to the indictment would have been meritless; (3) the Second Amended Habeas Corpus Petitioner should be denied; and (4) a Certificate of Appealability should be denied. The Court has reviewed *de novo* those portions of Judge Beckerman's Findings and Recommendation to which Petitioner has objected, as well as Petitioner's objections and Respondent's response. The Court agrees with Judge Beckerman's reasoning regarding those issues and ADOPTS those portions of the Findings and Recommendation.

For those portions of a magistrate's findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) ("There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate's report to which no objections are filed."); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate's findings and recommendations if objection is made, "but not otherwise"). Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act "does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard." *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that "[w]hen no timely objection is filed," the Court review the magistrate's recommendations for "clear error on the face of the record."

For those portions of Judge Beckerman's Findings and Recommendation to which neither party has objected, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews those matters for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

The Court **ADOPTS** Judge Beckerman's Findings and Recommendation, ECF 28. Petitioner's Second Amended Habeas Corpus Petition (ECF 13) is DENIED. The Court declines to issue a Certificate of Appealability on the basis that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 12th day of June, 2017.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge